

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action mailed March 17, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Office objects to claim 5 because of an informality. *Office Action* at ¶ 5. Claim 5 is hereby amended to cure the informality, in accordance with the suggestion of the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claim 5.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. *Office Action* at p. 3. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, claims 11-13 are amended herein to more clearly identify them as belonging to a class of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant believes that claims 11-13 satisfy all requirements for statutory subject matter in accordance with *In Re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 11-13.

The Office rejects claims 1-3 and 5-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2001/0040900 to Salmi et al. (hereinafter *Salmi*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,085,198 to Skinner (hereinafter *Skinner*). *Office Action* at ¶ 9. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

An aim of the present application is to limit interchanges between a terminal and a server. As described in the background of the invention section, the invention is directed toward curing “the problem of systematic and unnecessary transmission and storage of data relating to one and the same object for a number of multimedia pages in which the same object occurs” Specification as published at p. 1:36-p.2:2.

To that end, a server transmits “data relating to at least one object to be arranged in a multimedia page to be generated, with an instruction to store said data, identified by a link, in a terminal memory,” as recited in claim 1. As recited, the data is “identified by a link.” Subsequently, when the server transmits a descriptive file containing the aforesaid link, the data stored in the terminal memory can be retrieved, without any need for the terminal to transmit a request for the data to the server. In other words, as recited in claim 1, the server subsequently transmits “a descriptive file containing said link [which permits the terminal] to edit, on the

terminal, said object ... by [using the link to locate] the data stored in the terminal memory.”... Therefore, after the first step of transmitting from the server, the server knows what data is stored in the memory of the terminal. Further interchanges between the terminal and the server are not necessary for editing the multimedia page(s) where the object is to be arranged.

None of the cited documents discloses the control of the storage of data in the memory of the terminal, performed by the server as recited above. That is, none of the cited references teaches or suggests at least “transmitting, from the server, data relating to at least one object to be arranged in a multimedia page to be generated, with an instruction to store said data, identified by a link, in a terminal memory” as recited in claim 1.

Salmi fails to disclose storage in a terminal memory. More particularly, further uses of the data for editing new multimedia pages are not carried out in *Salmi*, nor even disclosed in that document.

Skinner fails to cure the deficiencies of *Salmi*. The Office asserts that *Skinner* teaches that a server can order the storage of the data in the memory of the terminal. However, the cited passage of *Skinner* merely discloses the storage of an object cache component. See *Skinner* at column 9:39-42. Skinner’s server does not know whether the data is resident or not in the memory of the terminal. In fact, in *Skinner*, there is no link provided between the data stored and an object used in a multimedia page. Therefore, the “client-side component” must send a request to the server for the given object if it is not already stored in the cache component. Consequently, the embodiment of *Skinner* does not limit interchanges between the terminal and the server.

Because *Salmi* does not provide storage in the memory of the terminal, *Salmi* also does not limit interchanges between the terminal and the server. Finally, none of the cited references teaches or suggests storage in a memory of the terminal, which is ordered by the server itself; the server thus knowing whether the data is stored or not in the terminal memory and thereby being able to “subsequently [transmit] a descriptive file containing said link [to a location in the terminal memory], to edit, on the terminal, said object in at least one multimedia page being generated, by reading the data stored in the terminal memory,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Salmi* in view of *Skinner*.

For the same or similar reasons, independent claims 11, 12 and 13 are also patentably distinguishable over *Salmi* in view of *Skinner*. It stands to reason that claims 2-3 and 5-10, which depend from claim 1, are also patentably distinguishable for at least the same reasons. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-13.

The Office rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Salmi* in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0152229 to *Peng* (hereinafter *Peng*). *Office Action* at ¶ 19. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and requests reconsideration.

Independent claim 1, from which claim 4 depends, is patentably distinguishable over *Salmi* as described above. *Peng* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Salmi*. Claim 4 recites an instruction that “includes a timer parameter of predetermined value defining an expiry date...” In accordance with this claim, the server knows that the data cannot be retrieved from the memory of the terminal after that expiry date. The server will thus proceed again with the first step of “transmitting ... data relating to at least one object” of claim 1. Therefore, according to claim 4, the terminal never asks the server for the data if said data said not used for editing multimedia pages.

For at least these reasons, claim 4 is patentably distinguishable over *Salmi* in view of *Peng*. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4.

CONCLUSION

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael I. Angert/
Michael I. Angert
Registration No.: 46,522
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.

Application No.: 10/589,198

Docket No.: 13798.005.00

Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant